

**REMARKS****Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed January 13, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 18, 19, and 28 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. It should be noted that claim 18 has been amended to correct a typographical error and not to substantively change its scope in any way.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-11, 15-20, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,571,245 to Huang et al (hereafter "Huang"). Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. patent 5,925,103 to Magallanes et al. (hereafter "Magallanes"). Claims 4, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of U.S. patent 6,512,526 to McGlothlin et al. (hereafter "McGlothlin"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 have been amended to clarify that these claims recite rendering a custom view based on a stored user context in which (1) an activity sequence is defined by a user as a collection of viewlets from different applications in which (a) each viewlet defines a coherent set of operations, and (b) each application is an ordered set of a plurality of viewlets. See paragraph 33 in the specification for support for this recited feature. Therefore, the pending independent claims require that each activity sequence that is defined comprise portions of two different applications (i.e., two viewlets from two applications respectively). Furthermore, each of these independent claims recite that the (2) custom view rendered (based on the user context) includes an association between the at least two viewlets in the activity sequence. See, for example, paragraph 36 in the specification for support for this specification where a particular sequence of the viewlets

may be one such association. These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by any of the applied references or their reasonable combination.

Specifically, the office action relies on Huang for disclosing these claimed features. *First*, the cited portions of Huang (col. 7 et al.) as well as complete disclosure only discloses a customizable desktop in which complete applications or other objects may be selected by a user. See col. 14, lines 21-24 of Huang which states that “[e]ach desktop object represents an application, a file, a folder, a document...” (emphasis added). Therefore, nowhere does Huang teach the claimed customized arrangement of viewlets (which are defined in the claims to be portions of an application) from different applications. One skilled in the computer science or programming arts would recognize that the word “application” as used in the claims has a clear meaning to those skilled in the art and files, folders, etc. are not considered to a part of an application (i.e., a viewlet).

*Second*, nowhere does Huang teach or suggest that a rendered custom view include an association between the viewlets (from different applications) in the activity sequence. Huang simply discloses that a user can customize his virtual desktop by selecting applications and files and does not even teach any association between the applications. Furthermore, as we have discussed above, the applications do not equate to the claimed viewlets.

Since these deficiencies in Huang are not cured by any of the other applied references, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending independent claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional reasons for their patentability when considered as a whole.

For example, claims 4, 13, and 22 recite that the activity sequence is defined based on a role associated with a user. As described, for example, in paragraph 39 this element requires that a role characteristic of a user shared with a group (for example, the salesman role) is used to define the activity sequence in the user context. In sharp contrast, the cited portion of the McGlothlin reference teaches that simply that a user profile is maintained for each user. See col. 7, lines 1-5 of McGlothlin. This is of course the opposite of the claimed feature in which an activity sequence of a user is defined based on a role associated with that

user so that the activity sequence does not have to be defined individually. Accordingly, this claimed feature is also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides an additional reason for the patentability of these claims.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request entry of and reconsideration based on the instant amendment and reply because it is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview or examiner's amendment would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 12, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

**Customer Number: 22428**

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee  
Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants